

ATHANASIUS' *DE INCARNATIONE*: AN EDITION REVIEWED

ATHANASIUS' treatise *On the Incarnation* very quickly became a classic; it was quoted as an authoritative text, if not during the author's lifetime, at least very shortly after his death, and had a powerful influence on the development of later Christian theology. Small but significant varieties of wording crept in, whole passages were rewritten, and the work was handed down in a rich and complex manuscript tradition which has not yet been completely explored. Most English students will now make its acquaintance in the edition by Robert W. Thomson, which has the great advantage of including Athanasius' earlier work *contra Gentes*, together with a useful introduction; its main defect, as reviewers have not failed to point out, is the inaccuracy of the translation. But there is room for a more extensive commentary; and since Professor Kannengiesser's edition¹ very largely meets this need, and will certainly provide the basis for scholarly work on the *de Incarnatione* for some time to come, it seems worth while, even after some lapse of time, to set down the results of some extended study.

The book consists of a massive Introduction (pp. 21–256) preceded by a bibliography and list of abbreviations, and the text and translation (pp. 258–468) followed by indexes of scriptural quotations, of Greek words, and of 'noms anciens'. Reviewers have already remarked on the great length of the Introduction and the disproportion of its parts. The first and fifth chapters deal very elaborately with the text, the third expands on the doctrine of the work; but the fifth chapter incorporates a comprehensive treatment of the Short Recension, examining its four witnesses in detail; and the third investigates a long list of verbs and nouns used in connection with the Incarnation. Although this provides material of much interest and value, one can hardly deny that a more balanced exposition could have emerged if these researches had been published elsewhere and the findings presented here in summary form.

In contrast, the very brief fourth chapter hardly begins to explore its subject, 'Le Recours à la Bible', though the author is exceptionally well qualified to do so, as witness his papers in the Daniélou tribute and elsewhere.² The second chapter ('Le Plan du Traité') is also fairly

¹ *Athanase d'Alexandrie: Sur l'Incarnation du Verbe*, edited by Charles Kannengiesser, 484 pages. (Sources chrétiennes No. 199.) Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1973.

² 'Le Recours au Livre de Jérémie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie', *Epektasis*

short, and calls for little comment as a whole; but one or two points of interest appear. I am inclined to think it a pity that Kannengiesser endorses the antithesis drawn by Harnack and Opitz between Athanasius and Eusebius, alleging that Eusebius conceived the work of Christ almost exclusively in terms of his teaching (see pp. 63 n. 1, 419 n. 1, and for Harnack, *La Bible et les Pères*, pp. 136–7). I believe this is overstated. Eusebius does indeed enlarge on the teaching function of the Logos, but it is by no means unimportant to Athanasius (see, e.g., *D.I.* 11–16), while the latter's theme of the salutary union of the Logos with a human body (*ibid.* 17) has close parallels in Eusebius' *Dem. Evang.* iv. 13 and vii. 1 (also *Laus* 14), which the editor has failed to note. At p. 389 n. 1 he has ignored Eusebius' citation of Isaiah liii in *Dem. Evang.* iii. 2. 54 (vv. 3b–8 cited *en bloc*, and 9–12 piecemeal shortly after); while anyone re-reading Eusebius' meditation on Psalm xxi (xxii), *ibid.* x. 8, will hardly concede that he is insensitive to the redemptive action of the crucified.

On the other hand, the editor's work on the text has been deservedly praised. His first chapter sets out the problems presented by the two recensions, notes some leading features of the Short Recension, and outlines his view of its origin. He argues that our four witnesses derive from a single archetype. This text, he shows convincingly, does not come from Athanasius' own hand, as Dr. Cross believed in 1949, but from a reviser familiar with his language and thought, whose activity is disclosed only by small divergences of vocabulary, and whose special theological interest was to emphasize the sovereignty of the divine Logos in relation to his human body and to play down the distinct humanity of Christ, no doubt in reaction to the importance attached to it by Athanasius' Antiochene friends of the school of Paulinus. In other words, the Short Recension derives from Athanasius' immediate disciples, already to some extent influenced by the ideas of Apollinaris (pp. 43–8). One notes, however, at this crucial point, that the different witnesses to the Short Recension do not quite agree on the way in which this general intention is pursued; it is the *Greek* manuscripts which systematically eliminate the phrase *ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ*; the Syriac version does not, but for its part attests an avoidance of the term *οὐρανοῦ*. It would seem, then, that these modifications were introduced subsequently to the common archetype which the editor assumes on pp. 30–3; he has to fall back on the idea of an 'évolution homogène' (p. 42), which to some extent blurs the impression of the Short Recension which he seeks to

(*Mélanges . . . Daniélou*), ed. J. Fontaine and C. K., pp. 317–25; 'Les citations bibliques du traité athanasién "Sur l'Incarnation du Verbe" et les "Testimonia"', *La Bible et les Pères, Colloque de Strasbourg . . . 1969*, pp. 135–60.

convey. In any case, none of these witnesses goes so far as to eliminate the *testimonia* to Christ as *ἀνθρωπος* in c. 33–4—viz. Num. xxiv. 17 and 7, and Is. liii. 3b—though at certain other places they rewrite the text very freely.

(Note here that the list of references to Christ as *ἀνθρωπος* on pp. 48–51 needs to be completed; add *D.I.* 16, *μὴ εἶναι ἐαυτὸν ἀνθρωπὸν μόνον*, 124 c 3, Rob. p. 24. 9, correcting the Migne reference to the passage actually cited, 124 b 14–c 1; also 34, *ἴνα μὴ τις αὐτὸν κοινὸν ἀνθρωπὸν ἐκ τοῦ πάθους ὑπολάβοι*, 156 a 5–6, Rob. p. 51. 7–8; and, surely, the *testimonia* mentioned above. At p. 50 l. 25 read ‘Deux fois’, not ‘Trois’. On p. 51 for ‘*D.I.* 41’, twice, read ‘*D.I.* 42’.)

The study of the text is taken up again in Chapter V, which begins with an account of the printed editions of the *D.I.* This leads on to a detailed study of the text printed by Robertson in his second edition of 1893, which served as a basis for the collations of the Long and Short Recensions made respectively by G. J. Ryan and R. P. Casey. (The reprint issued by F. L. Cross in 1939 is rightly passed over here, since Cross could not foresee the advantage of a line-by-line reproduction, so that his references differ, slightly but cumulatively, from the original.) Robertson professed to reproduce the text of S, the ‘Seguerianus’, or Coislin gr. 45, of Paris; but Ryan gives a list of twenty passages where ‘Robertson’s text has no discoverable manuscript authority’ (Ryan p. 4 n. 15, cited p. 170); in four of these cases, says Ryan, he follows the text of Migne. Kannengiesser shows that this note is misleading; of the four supposed agreements with Migne, one should delete 61. 28 and 72. 10; but in nine of the remaining sixteen cases Robertson’s text *does* agree with Migne, making eleven such cases in all. Moreover, of these eleven agreements between Robertson and Migne, seven in fact have manuscript authority, contrary to Ryan’s indications (Kg. p. 173). We are left with seven cases where Robertson *disagrees* with Migne and with all manuscript authority; these are only misprints, and Kannengiesser notes five more such unimportant errors, and the more curious case of 13. 15, where Migne has *οὗτως συνῶν* and Robertson prints these words between <> brackets. Here Kannengiesser’s remark that the reading *οὗτως συνῶν* was ‘forgée par Montfaucon’ might mislead English readers; both Montfaucon’s footnote and Robertson’s make it clear enough that they are following Theodore. And the ‘forgery’ is reproduced by Kannengiesser himself on p. 113!

Kannengiesser’s data certainly help us to correct Ryan; but he himself has not achieved complete accuracy; it is an impossible feat, he disarmingly protests (p. 187). At all events his list of references on p. 171, ostensibly based on Ryan’s p. 4 n. 15, wrongly introduces 22. 17 (a

conflation of its neighbours); and he has failed to notice three passages which Ryan should have mentioned if his collation on pp. 101–25 is correct, namely 53. 9–10, where there are two entries, not one (Robertson both puts $\epsilon\tau\iota$ forward and inserts $\ddot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\sigma$, with Migne but without manuscript authority), 53. 13, and 64. 24. 53. 13 is a minor matter, the spelling of $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\beta\alpha\nu\epsilon(\nu)$. The case of 64. 24 is more complex. Ryan notes 'omn. mss.' for the spelling $\epsilon\phi\eta\sigma\epsilon$; but Kannengiesser, p. 175, states that Robertson's $\epsilon\phi\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$ has the support of 'the γ family apart from T' (i.e. of ztyb¹ LQMT). Ryan also notes that $\pi\epsilon\pioi\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu$, read by Migne but printed in brackets by Robertson, has no manuscript support; but he contradicts this at p. 85 n. 121, stating here that it is omitted by F but *read* by all other manuscripts. This may well be correct; Kannengiesser's apparatus (at his 42. 34) has 'om. SF', but S has $\pi\epsilon\pioi\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu$ (fol. 69^r, l. 16), as I discover from the photographs once used by Dr. Cross.

If one assembles these various additions and deductions, Ryan's note is transformed out of all recognition. I think it should read: 5. 8, 9. 29, 11. 30, 19. 27, 34. 4, 37. 16, 38. 2, 52. 30, 53. 9, 53. 10, 53. 13, 53. 29, 55. 8, 58. 14, 61. 28, 64. 18, 70. 6, 78. 5, 78. 10, 81. 23, 82. 16 (noting also 13. 15, as above), where italic figures indicate agreement with Migne.

We pass to the more important question, why Robertson diverges in more than a hundred places from the text of S, which he professes to follow. (That he *does* so diverge has long been obvious; if he did not, there should have been no 'S' entries at all in Ryan's collation.) In the majority of cases, says Kannengiesser, he is simply following the Maurists and Migne; there are seven exceptions, noted on p. 175, where Robertson deserts both S and Migne, but always with the support of one or more of the English manuscripts. Of the cases where Robertson follows Migne, some are corrections of isolated errors in S; sometimes Robertson prints the reading of an English manuscript already adopted by Montfaucon; sometimes he follows him in a seemingly eccentric choice of authorities. I cannot comment on this in detail; but one point should be noted. We are told (p. 174) that Ryan failed to note Robertson's dependence on Migne partly because he did not collate the Geneva manuscript b¹, which is 'highlighted' by both Commelinus and the Maurists (cf. Ryan p. 64 n. 37). Kannengiesser identifies this manuscript with the 'Felckmann Anonymus 1', which is frequently cited in Montfaucon's apparatus. But the indications given by Opitz on pp. 93–5 and by Ryan, from Wallis, on p. 5, identify this 'Anonymus 1' with Geneva MS. 29 vol. 3, which proves to be an unimportant copy of H, the 'Goblerianus', and clearly distinguish it from b¹ = Geneva MS. 29 vol. 1 = Felckmann 2 (see esp. Opitz, p. 93). So this identification and the

argument stemming from it are faulty, though Kannengiesser's other remarks about b¹ may well be correct; the point is hard to establish without access to the manuscript; for surprisingly, in view of his comments on Ryan, Kannengiesser himself does not cite b¹ in his apparatus, though he claims to have collated it, and notes a few of its readings on p. 173. In this case, we are better informed by Thomson.

I have gone into some detail in discussing Kannengiesser's analysis of Robertson's procedure, since he makes it abundantly clear that Ryan's collation, though very much better than Casey's companion piece, exhibits numerous errors; these need to be corrected, and it will be very much easier to work through Ryan, manuscript by manuscript, rather than beginning again. In other words, Robertson's second edition, and Ryan's collation of it, still provide the basis for future work. The present critical text, despite its outstanding value, is no substitute, since it necessarily ignores a mass of minor variants which need to be considered in determining the relations of the manuscripts. Kannengiesser himself explains this selective procedure on pp. 253-4, and adds that he has given much fuller details of the Short Recension witnesses Σ CDd. It becomes apparent at p. 170—though he is too modest to say this at the outset—that he has personally collated all the manuscripts which he cites, so that he can refer to Ryan's mistakes, both here and in his review of Thomson's edition;¹ and one might hope that he would even now consent to publish a full revision of Ryan's collation; this would help to forward research, even though his warning that 100 per cent accuracy is not to be expected is, I fear, to the point.

The survey of printed editions ends with a list of translations (pp. 179-80). This needs correcting, at least for the English versions, one of which is omitted, while the two items dated 1954 are one and the same, which is little more than a reprint of Robertson. Amend as follows:

1. James Ridgeway, Oxford, 1880. (This was criticized by Robertson in the preface to his text of 1882, p. iii, as 'scarcely of sufficient exactness for the guidance of students'.)
2. Archibald Robertson, 1885 (companion to his text of 1882).
Reprinted 1891 (*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2nd ser., vol. 4, with slight changes).
Reprinted 1954 (*Library of Christian Classics*, iii), with slight changes, by E. R. Hardy.
3. T. Herbert Bindley, 1887 ('*Christian Classics*' series, iii).
Revised edition, 1903. (*Not* in series; a most attractive little book,

¹ 'Athanase édité par Robert W. Thomson', *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, lxi (1973), pp. 217-32.

though it follows Robertson too closely to be of much independent value.)

4. The anonymous version of 1944, and 5 and 6, Thomson's two versions, are correctly set down.

Much of the remainder of Chapter V (pp. 189–239) is devoted to an elaborate study of the Short Recension witnesses, namely the Syriac version (Σ) and the three Greek manuscripts CDd. Σ seems to have few singular features of theological interest, and the same is true of C, which is unfortunately very incomplete; but D shows some signs of separate revision, and the same is true in a far more marked degree of d, which attests a free rewriting on both literary and doctrinal grounds. A good example of the former comes at 4. 6, Kg. 2. 40–1, where d eliminates a faulty genitive absolute which is by no means obvious at first sight. When it comes to studying the longer passages peculiar to d, the rather clumsy arrangement of the Introduction makes it necessary to turn back to the tables of omissions and additions printed way back at pp. 28–9, as well as forward to the actual text, and possibly the editor himself gets a little lost; after much detailed work, including a survey of d's variant treatment of the words $\delta\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\sigma$, $\sigma\hat{\omega}\mu\alpha$, and $\Theta\epsilon\circ\sigma$, he concludes that d's *doctrinal* originality is a good deal less than Casey supposed. He may be right, but it is a pity that he has ignored what is perhaps the most intriguing of d's peculiarities, the citation of John x. 18 with its reference to a soul of Christ in 'addition 7', printed at p. 353.¹

So far, so good, though it has been tough going. But at this point, where the editor goes on to consider the influence of one recension on the other, one regrets most keenly that he has not been able to save some space for a serious attempt to deal with the indirect tradition. On pp. 43–6 there is a cursory treatment of the so-called 'Sermo Maior' and of some of the later writers who quote the *D.I.*; but there is no proper catalogue of indirect authorities; the uninstructed reader will do better with Thomson, pp. xxxi, xxxv, supplemented now by Christopher Lash's catalogue of Athanasian quotations in Severus,² and noting two florilegia recently published,³ which contain some further quotations, not of first-class interest. Astonishingly and regrettably, the apparatus

¹ Casey seems to be referring to this passage at p. xxii, ll. 10–14. Note, however, that John x. 18 is quoted by Athanasius at c. Ar. iii. 54, end.

² *Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie* (*Théologie Historique*, xxvii, ed. C. Kannengiesser, pp. 377–94).

³ L. Abramowski and A. van Roey, *Das Florilegium mit den Gregor-Scholien aus Vatic. Borg. Syr. 82 (OLP 1)*, Louvain, 1970 (see nos. 13, 14); L. Abramowski and Alan E. Goodman, *A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts*, Cambridge, 1972 (see nos. 16 and 26, vol. ii, pp. 80, 83).

to the text makes no reference at all to any of these quotations, whereas Thomson's much less ambitious edition offers at least some indications. This omission is the more serious in that the quotations are of crucial importance for the history of the text, and some of them are of great intrinsic interest, particularly those found in Severus of Antioch. Some of his passages, indeed, can hardly rank as quotations; though apparently in the style of Athanasius, they have no context in the *D.I.*, from which he thinks they come; and one would like to determine whether they exhibit a similar procedure and doctrinal interest to those of our Short Recension texts; in which case it might appear that this Recension offers only a selection out of a larger pool of variant texts that once existed, and on which d has drawn more freely than the others.

When discussing the Long Recension manuscripts, Kannengiesser completely endorses Ryan's judgement of their relations (in fact he reproduces his *Stemma Codicum*) and rejects Opitz's preference for the β group; he is thus able to conclude his Introduction with the words 'l'autorité du texte traditionel du *DI* athanasien se trouve renforcée d'une manière que nous espérons définitive'. And it is the fact that Thomson's edition, which appeared earlier in the same year, 1973 (p. 256 n. 1), gives a generally similar impression of the Long Recension manuscripts, and prints very much the same text. There are, however, differences of presentation. Kannengiesser cites manuscripts individually, where Thomson uses Greek letters (λ , μ , $\nu\phi\psi$) to denote them by groups, where these agree; in my view the superior precision and clarity of the longer method are well worth the extra space required. On the other hand, there is much to be said for Thomson's practice of relegating the longer variants of the Short Recension to a separate appendix; though it would have been even better if he had given this an apparatus to accommodate the often complex disagreements *within* this tradition, and numbered his lines for ease of reference. In Kannengiesser it is not always easy to reconstruct the text of individual Short Recension manuscripts; and sometimes at least the information is incomplete or misleading. Thus on pp. 330–1 the apparatus to 18. 6–13 completely ignores d's variants, though these are explained at length on pp. 214–15.

By way of a check on Kannengiesser's textual notes, I worked through the first five chapters in D, which is supposed to be fully covered, using Dr. Cross's photographs. It became clear that this collation, though very much better than my own experimental efforts, was far from perfect; I made the following emendations to the Short Recension apparatus:

Rob. Kg.

i. 4 i. 3 read: $\tauούτων^2$.

i. 8 i. 8 add: $\piάντα$: $\piάντας$ D.

Rob. Kg.

1. 16 1.15 after *ἴντι* καὶ delete D.
3. 16 2. 20 the third entry, γὰρ ἀν D, is redundant.
3. 27 2. 31 add: λεχθείη: ἐλέχθη D.
4. 29 3. 10 add: πίστευσον: πιστεύων D.
5. 21 3. 32 after ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς νόμον add δέδωκεν αὐτοῖς χάριν D (cf. p. 199).
6. 4 3. 45 add: τί ἀν: τί δ' ἀν D.
7. 11 4. 31 delete first CDd (it implies φύσιν δ θνητὸς δ ἄνθρωπος).
7. 18 4. 38 add: δὲ: δὲ δὴ D.
8. 8 5. 16 add: προειλήφει: προσειλήφει D.

In this sample passage, Kannengiesser has ninety notes which apply to D; thus for this manuscript alone we have found one positive error, seven omissions, and three faults of presentation. For the same passage, however, Thomson has only forty such notes, which contain two positive errors and one bad omission (D reads μὴ before *προνοεῖν* at his 2. 15).

Nevertheless, we have almost arrived at an agreed critical text; the divergences between Kannengiesser and Thomson, working independently, are few enough to be listed with some approach to completeness. In the table that follows, I ignore minor differences of spelling, such as -θνήσκω, σώζω, ζῶον, where Thomson omits the subscript; treatment of quotations; and punctuation, where the sense is not affected. There are some fairly obvious minor errors in Kannengiesser to be corrected at 1. 17, 14. 6 (the sentence continues), 20. 37, 36. 23 (*Ναυή*, but see below on the punctuation), 44. 16, 45. 16, 48. 10, 48. 44, 49. 26 (no comma), and 52. 10 (*τὸ τοιοῦτον*); and in Thomson at his 6. 10, 10. 27, 15. 24, 19. 10, 20. 10, 32. 10, 39. 24, 47. 1, and 56. 1, besides the errors of accentuation noted by Kannengiesser in his review (n. 26; see p. 382 n. 1 above). There is a common error at Kg. 2. 5 = T. 2. 4, where the preferred reading *μυθολογοῦντες* requires οἱ unaccented. Apart from the foregoing, I can find only twenty-two divergences, as follows:

Kg.

2. 4 Kg. *'Επικούρειοι* T. *'Επικούροι* T.'s misprint, prob. for *'Επικούριοι*.
3. 19 Kg. *πρὸ πάντων* T. *πάντων* No MS. authority for *προ*; I prefer <*προ*>.
3. 43 Kg. *φάγεσθε* T. *φάγησθε* Ryan 6.2 has *φάγεσθε**; the better.
14. 43-4 Kg. *λέγω . . . ἔργων* as parenthesis; T. brackets as gloss. I prefer Kg.
16. 26-7 Kg. *ἔαντὸν εἶναι τὸν Λόγον τοῦ Πατρός*: so most LR MSS. I prefer this. T. *ἔαντὸν εἶναι Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἔαντὸν εἶναι τὸν Λόγον τοῦ Πατρός*. Cf. Ryan 25. 2, Kg. p. 247. Longer text read by HOG; ΣCDd similar.

D d

17. 39 Kg. ἐρυπαίνετο T. ἐρρυπαίνετο Cf. Ryan 26. 17; Kg. cites ztyTKYM¹B for ἐρρ-, which I prefer.
18. 6 Kg. ἐγνώριζεν T. ἐγνώριζε Kg. p. 173 quotes Gtzb¹ QAMT for -εν, correcting Ryan 26. 28; but T.'s text has better support.
20. 13 Kg. πάντως T. πάντας Ryan 30. 3: πάντας SHHG, *παντως rell., exc. KAFY om. πάντως, *lectio difficilior*, prob. right.
21. 42 Kg. ἴσχυροποιεῖ T. ἴσχυροποίει. Either is defensible. T. = Rob. 32. 25.
24. 11 Kg. ἐγίνετο T. ἐγένετο Kg. has no textual note. Ryan 35. 28 cites SHONC only in favour of T.'s text.
32. 26 σὺ εἰ. om. Kg., habet T (with Rob. 48. 15, SHHGzty). Kg. prob. better.
34. 25 Kg. τὴν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν T. τὴν ὑπὲρ ἀνθρωπον αὐτοῦ δύναμιν. But Kg. p. 228 agrees with Cross in favour of the *longer* (SR) text!
35. 23 Kg. Ἀβραάμ [sic] T. Αμεράμ Kg. discusses, p. 168, but has no textual note here, and prints 'Amram' in his translation! Cf. Ryan 52. 27, *αβρααμ SHHWMBOKAFYG.
35. 49 Kg. κατέβαινεν T. κατέβαινε Kg. = Rob. 53. 13, *male*? See Ryan ad loc.
36. 4 Kg. Σαλομῶν T. Σολομῶν No textual note; Ryan, 53. 17: Σαλ- HGtzbMNAFY (but cf. 39. 25, where Kg. has Σολομῶν; Ryan 59. 16: Σαλ- GtzbNOAFY; so only HM support Kg.'s combination).
36. 22-4 Major difference of punctuation, discussed below.
36. 26 Kg. τίθεται T. τίθενται Kg. = Rob. 54. 11. Ryan gives *τίθενται SHHOGWMBOKAFYG. But Athanasius is usually careful about neuter plurals.
37. 30 Kg. οὐ γάρ ἔστιν T. οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν T. perhaps better?
39. 9 Kg. λέγοντος T. καὶ λέγοντος Kg. better; καὶ in S only, Ryan 59. 29.
41. 35 Kg. τὸν τοιοῦτον T. τοῦτον (= Rob.) Ryan 63. 17: τοῦτον SH only.
42. 29-34 Major disagreement, needing separate note.
43. 4 Kg. μόνῳ T. μόνον Ryan 65. 13: -ον SHG only.
48. 6-7 Kg. μαρτύρων αὐτοῦ T. μαρτύρων T's reading SHHO only.
50. 37 Kg. ἀποδέξηται T. ἀποδέξαιτο T.'s reading looks like a stylistic revision.
52. 13 Kg. οἱ δαίμονες T. δαίμονες
53. 26 Kg. καὶ εἴσι T. καὶ εἴσι T. perhaps better.

At 36. 22-4 Kannengiesser's translation makes the Amorites oppose Moses (cf. Num. xxi LXX), whereas the text, as punctuated, makes them oppose Joshua; so Thomson, both text and translation. I prefer the former reading; although the constructions are varied, this preserves a sequence of five patriarchs mentioned before their opponents, in clauses of roughly equal length.

At 42. 29–34 Thomson adopts the longer text of the Short Recension (as recommended by Ryan, p. 26), but complicates matters by printing eight extra words, ἀφθονως¹ . . . διακοσμων², so that πάντα διακοσμῶν appears three times. Kannengiesser has the shorter text of the Long Recension, adding εἰ at l. 31, as do Robertson and Cross. Thomson omits πεποιηκέναι probably following Ryan's error noted above (p. 381); Kannengiesser retains it, but wrongly alleges omission by S. I cannot construe Kannengiesser's text; but he may be correctly reproducing a primitive error.

Besides the points already noted, there is some further spring-cleaning to be done. In the translation, correct: 12. 6 ($\mu\bar{\eta}$ ignored); 12. 24–6 and 13. 40–1 (omissions); 25. 26 ('et' for 'en'?); 26. 9 (as Thomson); 32. 13 (ἀκμήν, cf. Matt. xv. 16); 35. 25 (πεπλήρωται, cf. Luke iv. 21 etc.); 40. 13 (ῷρα, not ὥρα!); and 55. 5 (ἄνθρωποι, subj.!). At p. 10, substitute 'z' for the *siglum Γ*. At pp. 43. 16 and 96. 4 'premier chapitre' is needed; also 'chapitre I' on p. 211. At p. 138 n. 1 an 'Index christologique' is mentioned, which cannot be found. At p. 163, rectify the first title; at p. 164 n. 4 make the last date 1519; and correct minor faults at 169. 14, 170. 16, 171. 19, 179. 6. At p. 228, use capitals for 'Short', and correct 'correction' to 'correcting'. At p. 293 n. 3 read (Prov.) 8. 22. At p. 471, Index under 'Psaumes', delete 24. 7 and 82. 6–7, and add their references to the preceding entries.

Some relief from the austereies of textual study can be found in the third chapter of the Introduction, which deals with Athanasius' doctrine of the original state of mankind, the fall, and finally the human condition and the saving work of the incarnate Logos (pp. 67–85 and 139–56). Even here the long central section—54 pages out of 90—is devoted to a lexicographical survey of the titles of Christ and the verbs and nouns used to describe the Incarnation. This leads to the potentially interesting discovery that the vocabulary used in the *D.I.* differs considerably from that of Athanasius' later works (pp. 138–9); but since this difference is not characterized or explained, one must regretfully write down this whole section as a collection of working notes, invaluable for specialists, but not wholly in place in its present context.

The beginning and end of the chapter are conceived on totally different lines. They might be described as a sympathetic elaboration of Athanasius' own conceptions; they gain immensely from the editor's intimate and devoted acquaintance with his thought; on the other hand, the treatment is not historical, in that there is no attempt to explain Athanasius' theology in the light of the tradition that he inherited; nor critical, since his work is simply held up for our inspection and admiration; one can hardly say that it brings out the strengths of Athanasius'

thought, since there is no admission of any weakness. Here it may be that a criticism from a rather different standpoint can break some new ground.

The editor asks a good and perceptive question on p. 142: why is it, he says, that the Logos is constantly said to have taken a human *body*, when it is the human *soul* that needs saving? (It appears from the footnote that he is not determined to argue that Athanasius really did attribute a human soul to the Logos; cf. the cautious p. 295 n. 3.) The solution outlined is roughly as follows. It is the *nous* in man which is the basis of his conformity to the Logos. Man's original state was an exercise of pure *nous* in contemplation of the Logos; but at the Fall, passion and the senses asserted themselves and the hegemony of *nous* was overthrown, which led to a progressive degradation of mankind; nevertheless, the power of spiritual vision was not wholly lost (pp. 146-7), though in practice paralysed and dimmed, as men attended to nothing but bodily passions and spectacles. The Logos then took a body, in order that man could contemplate him through the works of his body, through 'humble faith' rather than 'noetic ecstasy' (p. 155); by his example and indwelling power our this-worldly existence in the body is consecrated and redeemed, and opens the way to eternal life.

As a first comment, it must surely be said that this essay, though sensitive and coherent, offers an extremely selective view of the work of salvation. Athanasius teaches that the Logos took a body, not only to provide a visible demonstration of God's being, and to integrate human nature in his own person, but to die for our sins (8. 4, 9. 1, etc.), to overcome death (9. 2, 20. 2, etc.), and to assure us of the resurrection (10. 5, 22. 4, etc.); not to mention one or two subsidiary themes like renewal and recreation (14, 16. 5, 20. 1), or the defeat of the demons (15. 5, 25. 6), and the actual teaching ministry of Jesus, already mentioned.

A second comment might be that, as Kannengiesser describes him, Athanasius presents the work of our salvation as a transition from a first creation conceived on intellectualist and Platonic lines to a second creation more fully representative of catholic Christianity. The description begins with the rather startling thesis that 'La création personnelle et immédiate de l'homme se réalise selon la distinction du Père et du Fils' (p. 71). This could suggest that Athanasius assimilated the creation of man to the generation of the Logos; but, needless to say, no one has ever accused Athanasius, even in early life, of being a crypto-Arian; what the author means is that the Image of God is his Logos, and the 'Image-like' part of man ($\tauὸ\ κατ’\ εἰκόνα$) is his *nous*. The analogy is confirmed in that Athanasius applies the metaphor of the lyre both to the soul directed by the *nous* (C.G. 31, 32) and to the cosmos directed by the Logos (ibid. 38,

39, 42, 47, amending p. 78 n. 2). But then, both God's approach to man, and man's ideal response to God, are intellectual acts; and further, Athanasius implies that *nous* as such is incorruptible (pp. 77–8, 145–6); sin can only arise when it fails in its directive power and allows the passions to prevail. I have tried to criticize this moral scheme in another context,¹ and will only remark that it fails to recognize the possibility of misusing the intellect as such—it may be, through delight in one's own accomplishment—as well as obscuring the virtues of simple and unsophisticated saints.

I am inclined to think that this intellectualism is a genuine element in Athanasius' thinking; it consorts oddly with the more biblical and catholic strains; and the contrast between them should not be explained in terms of a consistently presented advance from one dispensation to another; one should rather acknowledge a certain incoherence, or at least a tension, in Athanasian theology, and account for this in terms of his mixed Platonic, Stoic, and Christian background—two leads which the author seems reluctant to follow. Thus, if the first man really was intended to worship God through his Logos in a 'noetic ecstasy', it is hard to see why the perceptible world was created at all;² but of course Athanasius takes creation for granted, and insists that it is good (*C.G.* 40), and moreover explains that paradise was a favourable environment for unfallen man (*D.I.* 3. 4); he might have noted that, according to Gen. ii. 19, unfallen Adam gave names to the animals, and to that extent occupied himself with perceptible beings. Again, Athanasius does not conceive the Logos exclusively as a source of *νοητά*, or as a pattern of virtues and graces; he is, and has been since the creation, directing the visible world (12. 3, 14. 6, 17. 1–2, etc.). The human decline is explained both in terms of the necessary instability of created things (which, however, the sun does not share!—43. 3) and in terms of sinful human choice. All this is intelligible if one concedes that Athanasius is following several distinct threads in a complex Christian and philosophical tradition; but it is not easy to bring together in a synoptic account.

When it comes to the difficult question of the place of the soul in the economy of salvation, I find Kannengiesser's explanation tantalizingly elusive. He seems to bring out two contrasting elements in Athanasius' picture of the soul. First, as the lyre image would suggest, it is organically connected with the *nous*, and receives through it the grace of 'being like

¹ In an address to the Oxford Patristic Conference, 1979: 'The concept of Mind and the Concept of God', to be published in the Festschrift for Donald MacKinnon, ed. B. L. Hebblethwaite and S. R. Sutherland.

² Cf. *D.I.* 3. 3, which draws on Plato's *Timaeus*; but for Athanasius God does not generously say to disorderly matter, 'Receive my beautiful order'; he says to nothing, 'Be'. And *nothing* hears and responds!

God's Image'—τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα (p. 78). Secondly, as he rightly points out, Athanasius always speaks of the soul, not *nous*, when he wishes to describe man's actual fallen state (p. 145). The Logos, then, assumes a human *nous* (p. 152), but under new conditions, when the human *nous* is reprehensibly turned towards sensible things, and so can best be taught through a body; on the other hand, when the *Eἰκών* is present, the *κατ' εἰκόνα* becomes superfluous (p. 151). I cannot see the logic of this. The sentence last noted would seem to show that a human *nous* (not 'soul') would be superfluous in the Logos, since it is the *nous* that is the seat of the *κατ' εἰκόνα* (p. 75, rightly). This contradicts p. 152; but then, does Athanasius actually teach that the Logos assumed a human *nous*? Further, even if one can ignore the sharp distinction between mind and soul, in view of their organic connection, it remains true that Athanasius does not only teach that the Logos assumed a body to give a visible demonstration of God's glory to sense-bound fallen man; but that he assumed a body like ours in order that the human body as such could be revived and purified (9. 4, 13. 8, 44. 2–45. 1); and it is here that one feels it most disturbing that Athanasius did not apply this principle to the soul.

It should of course be repeated that the editor is not out to save Athanasius' orthodoxy, by later standards, at all costs; he admits, discreetly but candidly, that Athanasius did not anticipate the problems which were to be raised by Apollinaris (p. 153). My own comments, I fear, may not have been equally discreet; but I have tried to set both my approvals and my reservations in the clearest possible light. It may be that more perceptive theologians can find inspirations that I have not fully appreciated in this exceptionally painstaking and devoted study.

G. C. STEAD